



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/954,997	09/17/2001	Bruce Liikanen	3123-376	7888
32093	7590	10/19/2005	EXAMINER	
HANSRA PATENT SERVICES 4525 GLEN MEADOWS PLACE BELLINGHAM, WA 98226			NEGRON, DANIELL L	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2651		

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/954,997	IIIKANEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Daniell L. Negrón	2651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7,9-27,30-36,39-41 and 44-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7,9-27,30-36,39-41 and 44-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 May 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-22, 24-27, 30-36, 39, 40, 41, 44, 45, and 60-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cunningham U.S. Patent No. 4,945,427.

Regarding claim 1, Cunningham discloses a disk drive comprising a magnetic disk having an annular data storage region between inner and outer diameters (Fig. 1, 12) and an actuator arm assembly (Fig. 1, 14) and a read element and a write element (Fig. 1, 16) wherein the actuator arm assembly (Fig. 1, 14) rotates about a second end (Fig. 1, 10) of the actuator arm.

Cunningham also discloses a disk drive wherein at least one of the read element skew angle and the write element skew angle never has a magnitude less than 45 degrees while the read element and the write element are located over the data storage medium (column 5, line 67 through column 6, line 9, and column 7, lines 13-27).

Furthermore, Cunningham shows discloses a range of head skew angles which overlap the claimed range of equal or greater than 45 degrees for recording tracks on a magnetic disk with increased data density. It is considered that the optimization of a range holds no patentable weight because it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation (see *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955)), and no unexpected result is to occur.

Regarding claim 2, Cunningham discloses a disk drive wherein the data storage region (12) has a plurality of concentric tracks (see Fig. 1) which include sectors including data sectors and servo sectors and wherein the servo sectors are written in a non-radially coherent manner (column 4, lines 41-46 and column 5, lines 3-10).

Regarding claim 3, Cunningham discloses a disk drive wherein the data storage region has a plurality of concentric tracks wherein servo sectors are printed on the magnetic disk surface prior to assembly into the disk drive (column 4, lines 41-63).

Regarding claim 4, Cunningham discloses a disk drive wherein the head is mounted such that at least one of the read element and the write element is not perpendicular to a centerline of the flexure arm (see Fig. 2, elements 14 and 16).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, claims 5 and 6 have limitations similar to those treated in the above rejection of claim 1, and are met by the reference as discussed above.

Regarding claim 7, Cunningham discloses a disk drive comprising a magnetic disk having an annular a data storage region extending from an inner diameter to an outer diameter (Fig. 1, 12) and an actuator arm assembly (Fig. 1, 14) and a read element and a write element (Fig. 1, 16) having skew angles, wherein the actuator arm assembly (Fig. 1, 14) rotates about a second end (Fig. 1, 10) of the actuator arm.

Cunningham also discloses a disk drive wherein at least one of the read element and the write element is mounted to a flexure arm mounted at at least a first non-zero angle such that the magnitude of a skew angle of at least one of the read element and the write element relative to the data storage region is never less than 45 degrees for any position within the entire data storage region (column 5, line 67 through column 6, line 9, and column 7, lines 13-27).

Furthermore, Cunningham shows discloses a range of head skew angles which overlap the claimed range of equal or greater than 45 degrees for recording tracks on a magnetic disk with increased data density. It is considered that the optimization of a range holds no patentable weight because it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation (see *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955)), and no unexpected result is to occur.

Regarding claim 9, Cunningham discloses a disk drive wherein at least one of the read element and the write element is mounted such that a skew angle of at least one of the read element and the write element relative to the data storage region is greater than 60 degrees for the entire data storage region (column 5, line 67 through column 6, line 9).

Regarding claim 10, Cunningham discloses a disk drive wherein the data storage region (12) includes a plurality of concentric tracks (see Fig. 1) which include sectors including data sectors and servo sectors and wherein the servo sectors are written in a non-radially coherent manner (column 4, lines 41-46 and column 5, lines 3-10).

Regarding claim 11, Cunningham discloses a disk drive wherein the data storage region includes a plurality of concentric tracks wherein servo sectors are printed on the magnetic disk surface prior to assembly into the disk drive (column 4, lines 41-63).

Regarding claims 12, 13, 15, and 16, Cunningham discloses a disk drive wherein the data storage region (12) includes a plurality of concentric data tracks each having a width associated therewith (column 3, lines 3-14).

Furthermore, the reference is considered to meet the limitations since the angle between the data track and read or write head forms a right triangle. A well-known trigonometric identity

teaches that the cosine of the opposite angle (i.e. skew angle) equals the quotient of the adjacent side (i.e. data track width) divided by the hypotenuse (i.e. write head width). Therefore, since the widths of the tracks and heads correspond to the sides of a right triangle, the identity discussed above can be manipulated in order to discover the correspondence of any value to the cosine as well as the inverse cosine of the skew angle.

Regarding claims 17-21 and 26, 27, 30, and 31, claims 17-21 and 26, 27, 30, and 31 have limitations similar to those treated in the above rejections of claims 7-11 respectively, and are met by the reference as discussed above.

Regarding claims 22, 24, and 25, claims 22, 24, and 25 have limitations similar to those treated in the above rejections of claims 12, 13, and 15 respectively, and are met by the reference as discussed above.

Regarding claim 32, claim 32 has limitations similar to those treated in the above rejection of claim 7, and are met by the references as discussed above. Claim 32 however also recites the following limitations:

A disk drive wherein the width of at least one of the write element and the read element is greater than the track width for each of the plurality of concentric data tracks as Cunningham discloses on column 5, lines 51-58.

Regarding claims 33 and 34, claims 33 and 34 have limitations similar to those treated in the above rejections of claims 10 and 11 respectively, and are met by the references as discussed above.

Regarding claim 35, Cunningham discloses a disk drive wherein the head is mounted such that at least one of the read element and the write element is not perpendicular to a centerline of the flexure arm (see Fig. 2, elements 14 and 16).

Regarding claim 36, claim 36 has limitations similar to those treated in the above rejection of claim 1, and are met by the reference as discussed above.

Regarding claim 39, claim 39 has limitations similar to those treated in the above rejections of claims 7 and 9, and are met by the references as discussed above.

Regarding claims 40 and 41, claims 40 and 41 have limitations similar to those treated in the above rejection of claim 1, and are met by the reference as discussed above.

Regarding claim 44, claim 44 has limitations similar to those treated in the above rejections of claims 7 and 9 respectively, and are met by the references as discussed above.

Regarding claim 45, method claim 45 is drawn to the method of using the corresponding apparatus claimed in claims 7 and 12. Therefore method claim 45 corresponds to apparatus claims 7 and 12 and is rejected for the same reasons of anticipation as used above.

Regarding claims 60-64, Cunningham discloses a disk drive wherein the read element and the write element are located on a head and wherein the head is substantially rectangular in shape (see Fig. 1 and disclosure thereof).

Regarding claim 65, method claim 65 is drawn to the method of using the corresponding apparatus claimed in claims 60-64. Therefore method claim 65 corresponds to apparatus claims 60-64 and is rejected for the same reasons of anticipation as used above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 14 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cunningham U.S. Patent No. 4,945,427 in view of Nepela et al U.S. Patent No. 5,793,550.

Regarding claim 14, Cunningham discloses a disk drive with all the limitations of claim 7 as discussed above, but fails to show a signal-to-noise ratio produced by the read element being at least 6 dB.

However, Nepela et al discloses a read head wherein the output current applied is optimized for the purpose of improving the signal to noise ratio (column 3, lines 56-65).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the disk drive as disclosed by Cunningham with the read head current optimization as taught by Nepela et al in order to increase the signal-to-noise ratio of the signal read by the magnetic head and hence to improve the quality of the output signals.

Regarding claim 23, claim 23 has limitations similar to those treated in the above rejection of claim 14, and are met by the references as discussed above.

5. Claims 46-59, 66, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cunningham U.S. Patent No. 4,945,427 in view of Cunningham et al U.S. Patent No. 5,790,341.

Regarding claims 46-48, Cunningham '427 discloses a method with all the limitations of claim 45 as discussed above, but fails to show a skewing step further including selecting the slew angle such that the width tolerance is increased by at least 30 percent.

However, Cunningham et al '341 discloses a method of changing the effective widths of the heads and thereby modifying the tolerance by skewing the head in a disk drive for the purpose of increasing the amplitude of the read signal for the purpose of improving the performance of the head (column 7, line 36 through column 8, line 7).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method disclosed by Cunningham '427 with the method of skewing the head as taught by Cunningham et al '341 in order to reduce interference in a read head and further to increase the amplitude of the read signal. Furthermore the percentage of the tolerance increase is considered merely readjusting the elements and no unexpected result is to occur.

Regarding claims 49-59, claims 49-59 have limitations similar to those treated in the above rejections of claims 46-48 respectively, and are met by the references as discussed above.

Regarding claims 66 and 67, Cunningham '427 discloses a method wherein the step of providing a head comprises providing a head, which is substantially rectangular in shape (see Fig. 1 and disclosure thereof).

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9-27, 30-36, 39-41, and 44-67 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniell L. Negron whose telephone number is 571-272-7559. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30am-5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R. Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DLN 
October 5, 2005


DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600